



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,654	03/20/2006	Hiroyuki Tsukashima	127412	4516
25944 7590 03/13/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
TAMAL KARL I				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2834				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/13/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,654

Applicant(s)

TSUKASHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

KARL I.E. TAMAI

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not disclose the lead wire and the coils being hardened by the permeation of the varnish. The specification does not dis

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa et al. (US Publication 20020050752) in view of Koiso (Japanese Publication No. 2002078301).

Katsuzawa et al. '052 discloses:

- A motor module (10, Figures 12 and 13) supplied with electric power from an external wiring (70) having a motor winding (7) and a terminal block (10) electrically connecting said motor winding to said external wiring.
- The terminal block (10) having an internal connector 81 with first contact below power terminal 84 mating perpendicular to the shaft with the internal conductor 81 via screw 82 and a second contact that mates with the stator winding leads 7 which have a deformation perpendicular to the shaft (figure 12) and a plate terminal 83 on the tip of the flexible lead 7 and connected to the internal connector 81 by a fixing screw 82.

Katsuzawa et al. '052 does not disclose:

- The motor winding being subjected to varnish treatment.
- The flexible member being higher in flexibility than the lead wire.
- The lead wire and the coil are hardened by the permeation of the varnish.

Koiso discloses:

The motor winding 3 is subjected to varnish treatment. The lead wire 1 is has a sleeve 12 that prevents the capillary flow past the sleeve. It is inherent that the portion of the lead wire between the connection 3 to the motor coil and the sleeve being subject to varnish and capillary attraction of the varnish into the insulation 2, where that portion is hardened with the hardening of the motor coil 3. The portion of the lead between the terminal connector 6 and the sleeve 12 is not subject the hardening of the varnish, therefore is more flexible that the lead wire connected to the stator coils. The advantage of Koiso is to prevent hardening the lead wire (translation paragraphs 0013, 0014) to prevent defects in the lead wire (0002).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the electric motor art at the time the invention was made to provide a motor winding of Katsuzawa (figures 12 and 13) with lead wire and coils subject to varnish permeation to protect the stator core and windings in an enclosed compressor motor, with a portion of the lead wire being a member more flexible than the lead wire to prevent defect in the lead wire due to hardening, as taught by Koiso.

6. Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa et al. '052 and Koiso (Japanese Publication No. 2002078301) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sasamoto et al. (Sasamoto)(US 5132584). Katsuzawa and Koiso teach every aspect of the invention except the flexible member being a braided wire or a plate like conductor. Sasamoto teaches the flexible braided wire 57 (col. 6, line 58), shown a plate like conductor with a deformable portion

57a (col. 6, line 37) to conducts electricity to the stator windings but reduces the transmissions of vibrations between the stator and the support. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the machine of Katsuzawa and Takao with a braided or plate conductor to provide an electrical conductor with reduced vibration transmission, as taught by Sasumoto.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl I.E. Tamai whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 2036.

The examiner can be normally contacted on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Quyen Leung, can be reached at (571) 272 - 8188. The facsimile number for the Group is (571) 273 - 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Karl I Tamai/
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
March 12, 2009